



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/646,553	09/19/2000	Michel Gillet	BEIERDORF 65	1497
7055	7590	08/21/2006	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			SIMONE, CATHERINE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1772

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/646,553

Applicant(s)

GILLET ET AL.

Examiner

Catherine Simone

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action/or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/30/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejections

1. The 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 16-29 of record in the previous Office Action mailed 12/28/05, Page 2, Paragraph #3 has been withdrawn due to the Applicant's amendment filed 5/30/06.
2. The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 16-29 of record in the previous Office Action mailed 12/28/05, Page 3, Paragraph #5 has been withdrawn due to the Applicant's amendment filed 5/30/06.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 17, 18 and 21-28 over Murayama et al. in view of Van Gompel of record in the previous Office Action mailed 12/28/05, Pages 3-5, Paragraph #7 has been withdrawn due to the Applicant's amendment filed 5/30/06.
4. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 4 and 29 over Murayama et al. in view of Van Gompel and in view of Haffner et al. of record in the previous Office Action mailed 12/28/05, Pages 5-6, Paragraph #8 has been withdrawn due to the Applicant's amendment filed 5/30/06.
5. The 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 16, 19 and 20 over Murayama et al. in view of Van Gompel and in view of Masatoshi of record in the previous Office Action mailed 12/28/05, Pages 6-7, Paragraph #9 has been withdrawn due to the Applicant's amendment filed 5/30/06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1772

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 31-35 and 37-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The recitations "the inner tie layer being in *direct* contact with the second layer" in claims 31, 43 and 50, "area weight" in claims 33, 34, 45 and 46, "*one or more C₄-C₁₀ α-olefins*" in claim 35, "*the thermoplastic elastomer comprises a thermoplastic polyolefin having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³*" in claim 37, "*the thermoplastic elastomer comprises at least one of a copolymer of ethylene and polar comonomers and a mixture of LDPE and LLDPE, prepared by a metallocene-catalyzed process*" in claim 38, "a macroembossed effect is transferred from the elastic textile sheet to the microembossed polymer film" in claims 39 and 54, "*a thermoplastic elastomer having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³*" in claim 40, "*the thermoplastic elastomer comprises a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α-olefins*" in claim 41, "the polymer film comprises at least 65% of the *thermoplastic polyolefin*" in claim 42, "a macroembossed effect is transferred from the textile sheet to the polymer film" in claim 47, "both the inner layer and the outer layer comprise a thermoplastic polyolefin having a melt index of from 1 to 20g/(10min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³" in claim 50, "*the thermoplastic polyolefin comprises a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α-olefins*" in claim 52 and "the elastic polymer film comprises *at least 65% of the thermoplastic polyolefin*"

Art Unit: 1772

in claim 53 are deemed new matter. The specification, as originally filed, does not provide support for the invention as is now claimed.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "the thermoplastic polyolefin" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 30-34, 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. (US 5,633,070) in view of Van Gompel (US 4,753,840) and further in view of Wu et al. (US 5,202,173).

Regarding claims 30 and 39, Murayama et al. discloses an elastic laminate comprising a first layer of an elastic polymer film and a second layer of an elastic textile sheet, built from elastic fibers, and the second layer carries a self-adhesive coating on a side which is opposite to a

Art Unit: 1772

side which faces the first layer (see col. 2, lines 1-30). However, Murayama et al. fails to disclose the textile sheet being macroembossed and the polymer film being microembossed.

Van Gompel teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have an elastic textile sheet macroembossed (see col. 4, lines 50-59, and col. 5, lines 1-8 and lines 20-32) for the purpose of providing the sheet with a soft cloth like feel and appearance. Wu et al. teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a polymer film microembossed (see col. 3, lines 35-47) for the purpose of providing the film with an ultra soft, cloth-like texture.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the elastic textile sheet in Murayama et al. to be macroembossed as suggested by Van Gompel in order to provide the sheet with a soft cloth like feel and appearance. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the polymer film in Murayama et al. to be microembossed as suggested by Wu et al. in order to provide the film with an ultra soft, cloth-like texture.

Regarding claim 31, Murayama et al. discloses the polymer film including an outer layer and an inner tie layer, the inner tie layer being in direct contact with the second layer (see col. 2, lines 64-65). Regarding claim 32, the inner and outer layers in Murayama et al. are coextruded (see col. 2, line 62). Regarding claim 33, the polymer film in Murayama has an area weight of from 15 to 150 g/m² and the textile sheet in Murayama has an area weight of from 25 to 200 g/m² (see col. 2, lines 37-38). Regarding claim 34, the polymer film in Murayama has an area weight of from 35 to 60 g/m² and the textile sheet in Murayama has an area weight of from 30 to

Art Unit: 1772

100 g/m² (see col. 2, lines 37-38). Regarding claim 36, the polymer film in Murayama et al. comprises at least 65% of a thermoplastic elastomer (see col. 2, lines 19-22 and 56-60).

12. Claim 35, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. (US 5,633,070) in view of Van Gompel (US 4,753,840) and in view of Wu et al. (US 5,202,173) and further in view of Haffner et al. (US 6,096,014).

Murayama et al, Van Gompel and Wu et al. teach the elastic laminate as detailed above. However, Murayama et al. fails to disclose the polymer film including a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ and the polymer film including at least one of a copolymer of ethylene and polar comonomers and a mixture of LDPE and LLDPE, prepared by a metallocene-catalyzed process. Haffner et al. teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a polymer film including a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins (see col. 3, lines 58-60) having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ (see col. 4, Table A and col. 5, line 50) and to have a polymer film including at least one of a copolymer of ethylene and polar comonomers and a mixture of LDPE and LLDPE, prepared by a metallocene-catalyzed process (see col. 3, line 60 to col. 4, line 56) for the purpose of providing a breathable film that has high water vapor transmission rate and toughness that impart a wide variety of functionalities including vapor permeability, liquid impermeability, and comfort. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the polymer film in Murayama et al. to include a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ and to include at least one of a copolymer of

Art Unit: 1772

ethylene and polar comonomers and a mixture of LDPE and LLDPE, prepared by a metallocene-catalyzed process as suggested by Haffner et al. in order to provide a breathable film that has high water vapor transmission rate and toughness that impart a wide variety of functionalities including vapor permeability, liquid impermeability, and comfort.

13. Claims 40-46, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. (US 5,633,070) in view of Van Gompel (US 4,753,840) and further in view of Haffner et al. (US 6,096,014).

Regarding claims 40 and 41, Murayama et al. discloses an elastic laminate comprising a first layer of an elastic polymer film and a second layer of an elastic textile sheet, built from elastic fibers, and carries a self-adhesive coating on a side which is opposite to a side which faces the first layer (see col. 2, lines 1-30). However, Murayama et al. fails to disclose the elastic sheet being macroembossed and the polymer film comprising a thermoplastic elastomer having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ and the thermoplastic elastomer containing a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins.

Van Gompel teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have an elastic textile sheet macroembossed (see col. 4, lines 50-59, and col. 5, lines 1-8 and lines 20-32) for the purpose of providing the sheet with a soft cloth like feel and appearance. Haffner et al. teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a polymer film including a thermoplastic elastomer having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ (see col. 4, Table A and col. 5, line 50) and the thermoplastic elastomer containing a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins (see col. 3, lines 58-60) for the purpose of providing a breathable film that has high water vapor transmission rate and

Art Unit: 1772

toughness that impart a wide variety of functionalities including vapor permeability, liquid impermeability, and comfort.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the elastic textile sheet in Murayama et al. to be macroembossed as suggested by Van Gompel in order to provide the sheet with a soft cloth like feel and appearance. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the polymer film in Murayama et al. to include a thermoplastic elastomer having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ and have the thermoplastic elastomer contain a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α-olefins as suggested by Haffner et al. in order to provide a breathable film that has high water vapor transmission rate and toughness that impart a wide variety of functionalities including vapor permeability, liquid impermeability, and comfort.

Regarding claim 42, the polymer film in Murayama et al. comprises at least 65% of the thermoplastic polyolefin (see col. 2, lines 20 and 58). Regarding claim 43, Murayama et al. discloses the polymer film including an outer layer and an inner tie layer, the inner tie layer being in direct contact with the second layer (see col. 2, lines 64-65). Regarding claim 44, the inner and outer layers are coextruded (see col. 2, line 62). Regarding claim 45, the polymer film in Murayama has an area weight of from 15 to 150 g/m² and the textile sheet in Murayama has an area weight of from 25 to 200 g/m² (see col. 2, lines 37-38). Regarding claim 46, the polymer film in Murayama has an area weight of from 35 to 60 g/m² and the textile sheet in Murayama has an area weight of from 30 to 100 g/m² (see col. 2, lines 37-38).

Regarding claims 48 and 49, Murayama et al. also fails to disclose the laminate showing no more than 10% permanent deformation in either the transverse or longitudinal direction after elongation by 50% and 100% of its original length. However, Murayama et al. teaches an elongation at break (see col. 5, table 1) and the laminate consists of all elastic layers (see col. 2, lines 30-33 and lines 56-60). Therefore, the permanent deformation of the laminate would be readily determined through routine experimentation by one having ordinary skill in the art depending on the desired end results. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the laminate in Murayama et al. to show no more than 10% permanent deformation in either the transverse or longitudinal direction after elongation by 50% and 100% of its original length, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art absence of showing unexpected results. MPEP 2144.05(II).

14. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. (US 5,633,070) in view of Van Gompel (US 4,753,840) and in view of Haffner et al. (US 6,096,014) and further in view of Wu et al. (US 5,202,173).

Murayama et al., Van Gompel and Haffner et al. teach the elastic laminate as detailed above. However, Murayama et al. fails to teach the polymer film being microembossed. Wu et al. teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a polymer film microembossed (see col. 3, lines 35-47) for the purpose of providing the film with an ultra soft, cloth-like texture. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the polymer film in Murayama et al. to

Art Unit: 1772

be microembossed as suggested by Wu et al. in order to provide the film with an ultra soft, cloth-like texture.

15. Claims 50-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murayama et al. (US 5,633,070) in view of Van Gompel (US 4,753,840) and further in view of Wu et al. (US 5,202,173) and further in view of Haffner et al. (US 6,096,014).

Regarding claims 50, 52 and 54, Murayama et al. discloses an elastic laminate comprising a first layer of an elastic polymer film and a second layer of an elastic textile sheet, built from elastic fibers, and the second layer carries a self-adhesive coating on a side which is opposite to a side which faces the first layer (see col. 2, lines 1-30), and the polymer film comprises an outer layer and an inner tie layer, the inner tie layer being in direct contact with the second layer (see col. 2, lines 64-65). However, Murayama et al. fails to disclose the elastic textile sheet being macroembossed, the polymer film being microembossed and both the inner layer and outer layer comprising a thermoplastic polyolefin having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ and containing a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins.

Van Gompel teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have an elastic textile sheet macroembossed (see col. 4, lines 50-59, and col. 5, lines 1-8 and lines 20-32) for the purpose of providing the sheet with a soft cloth like feel and appearance. Wu et al. teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a polymer film microembossed (see col. 3, lines 35-47) for the purpose of providing the film with an ultra soft, cloth-like texture. Haffner et al. teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a polymer film including a thermoplastic polyolefin having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from

Art Unit: 1772

860 to 900 kg/m³ (see col. 4, Table A and col. 5, line 50) and containing a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins (see col. 3, lines 58-60) for the purpose of providing a breathable film that has high water vapor transmission rate and toughness that impart a wide variety of functionalities including vapor permeability, liquid impermeability, and comfort.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the elastic textile sheet in Murayama et al. to be macroembossed as suggested by Van Gompel in order to provide the sheet with a soft cloth like feel and appearance. Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the polymer film in Murayama et al. to be microembossed as suggested by Wu et al. in order to provide the film with an ultra soft, cloth-like texture. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified both the outer layer and inner layer of the polymer film in Murayama et al. to include a thermoplastic polyolefin having a melt index of from 1 to 20 g/(10 min) and a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³ and contain a copolymer of ethylene and one or more C₄-C₁₀ α -olefins as suggested by Haffner et al. in order to provide a breathable film that has high water vapor transmission rate and toughness that impart a wide variety of functionalities including vapor permeability, liquid impermeability, and comfort.

Regarding claim 51, note the inner and outer layers in Murayama et al. are coextruded (see col. 2, line 62). Regarding claim 53, the elastic polymer film in Murayama et al. comprises at least 65% of the thermoplastic polyolefin (see col. 2, line 20 and line 58).

Regarding claim 55, Murayama et al. also fails to disclose the laminate showing no more than 10% permanent deformation in either the transverse or longitudinal direction after elongation by 50% of its original length. However, Murayama et al. teaches an elongation at break (see col. 5, table 1) and the laminate consists of all elastic layers (see col. 2, lines 30-33 and lines 56-60). Therefore, the permanent deformation of the laminate would be readily determined through routine experimentation by one having ordinary skill in the art depending on the desired end results. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the laminate in Murayama et al. to show no more than 10% permanent deformation in either the transverse or longitudinal direction after elongation by 50% of its original length, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art absence of showing unexpected results. MPEP 2144.05(II).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 5/30/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants state that they "are unable to find in Haffner any disclosure regarding an ethylene copolymer having a density of from 860 to 900 kg/m³. The passages of Haffner relied on by the Examiner in this regard clearly do not support this allegation. Specifically, the copolymers listed in Table A in col. 4 of Haffner have densities of from 0.9155 to 0.917 g/cm³, i.e. significantly above .900 g/cm³". Applicants then argue "Haffner neither teaches nor suggests using a polyolefin having a density in the range from 0.860 to 0.900 g/cm³ for the polymer film

Art Unit: 1772

of an elastic laminate thereof with a textile sheet, let alone teaches or suggests that highly improved elastic properties compared to the use of a polyolefin of higher density are associated therewith".

However, it is to be pointed out that Haffner discloses ethylene copolymers have a density of at least 0.900 g/cm^3 (see col. 5, line 50). Additionally, in Table 1 (composition F) in col. 11 of Haffner, Haffner discloses the polyolefin having a density of 0.900 g/cm^3 . Therefore, Haffner clearly teaches a polyolefin having a density of 0.900 g/cm^3 , which clearly falls within the claimed range of 0.860 to 0.900 g/cm^3 for the density of the polyolefin as recited in claims 40 and 50.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 1772

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catherine Simone whose telephone number is (571)272-1501.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Catherine A. Simone
Examiner
Art Unit 1772
August 10, 2006


RENA DYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Tech Center 1700

8/15/06